

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
WESTERN DIVISION

ARTHUR JAMES DAVIS,

Plaintiff,

vs.

No.: 2:18-cv-2833-JTF-cgc

**THE STANDARD INSURANCE CO.,
CITY OF MEMPHIS GOV
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND
CODE ENFORCEMENT,**

Defendants.

**ORDER GRANTING LEAVE TO PROCEED *IN FORMA PAUPERIS*
REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

On November 30, 2018, plaintiff Arthur James Davis filed a *pro se* complaint and a motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*. (D.E. # 1 & 2.) This case has been referred to the United States magistrate judge for management and for all pretrial matters for determination and/or report and recommendation as appropriate pursuant to Administrative Order 2013-05¹.

Federal law provides that the “clerk of each district court shall require parties instituting any such civil action, suit or proceeding in such court, whether by original process, removal or otherwise, to pay a filing fee of \$400,” 28 U.S.C. § 1914(a). To ensure access to the courts, however, 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a) permits an indigent plaintiff to avoid payment of filing fees by filing

¹ The instant case has been referred to the United States Magistrate Judge by Administrative Order pursuant to the Federal Magistrates Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 631-639. All pretrial matters within the Magistrate Judge’s jurisdiction are referred pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A) for determination, and all other pretrial matters are referred pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B)-(C) for report and recommendation.

an *in forma pauperis* affidavit. Under that section, the Court must conduct a satisfactory inquiry into the plaintiff's ability to pay the filing fee and prosecute the lawsuit. A plaintiff seeking *in forma pauperis* standing must respond fully to the questions on the Court's *in forma pauperis* form and execute the affidavit in compliance with the certification requirements contained in 28 U.S.C. § 1746.

In this case, the Plaintiff has submitted a properly completed and executed *in forma pauperis* affidavit. The information set forth in the affidavit satisfies Plaintiff's burden of demonstrating that he is unable to pay the civil filing fee. Accordingly, the motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* is GRANTED. The Clerk shall record the defendants as Standard Insurance Company and City of Memphis.

The complaint was filed using the form for alleging "violation of civil rights under 42 U.S.C. § 1983." Plaintiff's "Statement of Claim" alleges that Plaintiff experienced injuries to his left arm and hand in a on the job automobile accident in 2003 while an employee of the City of Memphis Code Enforcement Division. While awaiting surgery related to the injuries, Plaintiff became addicted to pain medication and suffered post traumatic stress disorder. Plaintiff returned to work January 2004 but found it difficult to function because of the drug addiction and mental illness. Plaintiff filed a disability claim with Defendant Standard Insurance Co. and was told that the payout for mental disorders was a two year period. Plaintiff appealed the discontinuance of payments in 2008 and was denied. In 2012, Plaintiff received a letter refusing reinstatement and payment. Plaintiff seeks \$3.7 million dollars.

The Court is required to screen *in forma pauperis* complaints and to dismiss any complaint, or any portion thereof, if the action:

- (i) is frivolous or malicious;
- (ii) fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted; or
- (iii) seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief.

28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2).

In assessing whether the complaint in this case states a claim on which relief may be granted, the Court applies the standards under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6), as stated in Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 677-79 (2009), and in Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555-57 (2007). Hill v. Lappin, 630 F.3d 468, 470-71 (6th Cir. 2010). “Accepting all well-pleaded allegations in the complaint as true, the Court ‘consider[s] the factual allegations in [the] complaint to determine if they plausibly suggest an entitlement to relief.’” Williams v. Curtin, 631 F.3d 380, 383 (6th Cir. 2011) (quoting Iqbal, 556 U.S. at 681) (alteration in original). “[P]leadings that . . . are no more than conclusions are not entitled to the assumption of truth. While legal conclusions can provide the framework of a complaint, they must be supported by factual allegations.” Iqbal, 556 U.S. at 679; *see also* Twombly, 550 U.S. at 555 n.3 (“Rule 8(a)(2) still requires a ‘showing,’ rather than a blanket assertion, of entitlement to relief. Without some factual allegation in the complaint, it is hard to see how a claimant could satisfy the requirement of providing not only ‘fair notice’ of the nature of the claim, but also ‘grounds’ on which the claim rests.”).

“A complaint can be frivolous either factually or legally. Any complaint that is legally frivolous would *ipso facto* fail to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.” Hill, 630 F.3d at 470 (citing Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 325, 328-29 (1989)).

Whether a complaint is factually frivolous under §§ 1915(b)(1) and 1915(e)(2)(B)(i) is a separate issue from whether it fails to state a claim for relief. Statutes allowing a complaint to be dismissed as frivolous give “judges not only the authority to dismiss a claim based on an indisputably meritless legal theory, but also the unusual power to pierce the veil of the complaint’s factual allegations and dismiss those claims whose factual contentions are clearly baseless.” Neitzke, 490 U.S. at 327, 109 S. Ct. 1827 (interpreting 28 U.S.C. § 1915). Unlike a dismissal for failure to state a claim, where a judge must accept all factual allegations as true, Iqbal, 129 S. Ct. at 1949-50, a judge does not have to accept “fantastic or delusional” factual allegations as true in prisoner complaints that are reviewed for frivolousness. Neitzke, 490 U.S. at 327-28, 109 S. Ct. 1827.

Id. at 471.

“*Pro se* complaints are to be held to less stringent standards than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers, and should therefore be liberally construed.” Williams, 631 F.3d at 383 (internal quotation marks omitted). *Pro se* litigants, however, are not exempt from the requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Wells v. Brown, 891 F.2d 591, 594 (6th Cir. 1989); *see also* Brown v. Matauszak, 415 F. App’x 608, 613 (6th Cir. 2011) (“[A] court cannot create a claim which [a plaintiff] has not spelled out in his pleading”) (internal quotation marks omitted); Payne v. Secretary of Treas., 73 F. App’x 836, 837 (6th Cir. 2003) (affirming *sua sponte* dismissal of complaint pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2) and stating, “[n]either this court nor the district court is required to create Payne’s claim for her”); *cf. Pliler v. Ford*, 542 U.S. 225, 231 (2004) (“District judges have no obligation to act as counsel or paralegal to *pro se* litigants.”); Young Bok Song v. Gipson, 423 F. App’x 506, 510 (6th Cir. 2011) (“[W]e decline to affirmatively require courts to ferret out the strongest cause of action on behalf of *pro se* litigants. Not only would that duty be

overly burdensome, it would transform the courts from neutral arbiters of disputes into advocates for a particular party. While courts are properly charged with protecting the rights of all who come before it, that responsibility does not encompass advising litigants as to what legal theories they should pursue.”), *cert. denied*, ___ U.S. ___, 132 S. Ct. 461 (2011).

It is RECOMMENDED that the court does not have subject matter jurisdiction over Plaintiff’s claim. Federal district courts have original jurisdiction over civil actions arising under the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States or civil actions where the matter in controversy exceeds the sum or value of \$75,000 and is between citizens of different states. 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and 1332. If Plaintiff seeks to state a claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983,² he must allege two elements: (1) a deprivation of rights secured by the “Constitution and laws” of the United States (2) committed by a defendant acting under color of state law. Adickes v. S.H. Kress & Co., 398 U.S. 144, 150 (1970). In the instant case, Plaintiff has not stated in the Complaint in what manner the Standard Insurance Company was under color of state law and what actions Standard Insurance Company took to deprive Plaintiff of rights secured by the “Constitution and laws” of the United States. Plaintiff has not alleged any actions or omissions by the City of Memphis or its subdivision, the Department of Housing and Code Enforcement, much less any that would constitute a deprivation of constitutional rights³.

² Section 1983 provides: Every person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State or Territory or the District of Columbia, subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for redress. For the purposes of this section, any Act of Congress applicable exclusively to the District of Columbia shall be considered to be a statute of the District of Columbia.

³ Plaintiff did not allege a claim for denial of disability benefits under an employee benefit plan regulated by the Employment Retirement Income Security Act (hereinafter “ERISA”), however, had he done so, Plaintiff’s claim was

Therefore, it is RECOMMENDED that, to the extent that Plaintiff alleges a claim pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 that it be denied with prejudice for failure to state a claim.

The Court must also consider whether Plaintiff should be allowed to appeal this decision *in forma pauperis*, should he seek to do so. The United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit requires that all district courts in the circuit determine, in all cases where the appellant seeks to proceed *in forma pauperis*, whether the appeal would be frivolous. Twenty-eight U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) provides that “[a]n appeal may not be taken *in forma pauperis* if the trial court certifies in writing that it is not taken in good faith.”

The good faith standard is an objective one. Coppedge v. United States, 369 U.S. 438, 445 (1962). The test under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a) for whether an appeal is taken in good faith is whether the litigant seeks appellate review of any issue that is not frivolous. Id. It would be inconsistent for a district court to determine that a complaint should be dismissed prior to service on the defendants, but has sufficient merit to support an appeal *in forma pauperis*. See Williams v. Kullman, 722 F.2d 1048, 1050 n.1 (2d Cir. 1983). The same considerations that lead the Court to recommend dismissal of this case for failure to state a claim also compel the conclusion that an appeal would not be taken in good faith. It is therefore RECOMMENDED that the Court CERTIFY, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), that any appeal in this matter by Plaintiff would not be taken in good faith and Plaintiff may not proceed on appeal *in forma pauperis*.

not timely filed. The Sixth Circuit has held that the appropriate statute of limitations for an ERISA denial of benefits claim is the same as the Tennessee statute of limitations for breach of contract – six years. See, Winnett v. Caterpillar, Inc., 609 F.3d 404, 408 (6th Cir. 2010) The statute of limitations begins to run when “the breach becomes ‘clear and unequivocal.’” Id at 409 citing Morrison v. Marsh & McLennan Co., 439 F.3d 295, 302 (6th Cir. 2006). Plaintiff avers that his appeal was denied in 2008 therefore his suit should have been filed in 2014 at the latest.

Signed this 1st day of July, 2019.

s/ Charmiane G. Claxton
CHARMIANE G. CLAXTON
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

**ANY OBJECTIONS OR EXCEPTIONS TO THIS REPORT MUST BE FILED WITHIN
FOURTEEN (14) DAYS AFTER BEING SERVED WITH A COPY OF THE REPORT. 28
U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). FAILURE TO FILE SAID OBJECTIONS OR EXCEPTIONS
WITHIN FOURTEEN (14) DAYS MAY CONSTITUTE A WAIVER OF OBJECTIONS,
EXCEPTIONS, AND ANY FURTHER APPEAL**